

**REMARKS**

The Office Action mailed July 11, 2006 has been carefully considered. Within the Office Action Claims 38-55 and 57-59 have been rejected. The Applicant has amended Claims 38, 49 and 55. Reconsideration in view of the above amendments and following remarks is respectfully requested.

**Rejection under U.S.C. § 102**

Claims 38, 39, 42, 43, 46, 47, 52, 54, 55, 58 and 59 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being allegedly anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 4,667,182 to Murphy (hereinafter “Murphy”). The Applicant respectfully traverses.

Murphy describes a stylus for interactive use with a graphics input tablet which provides a user with a tactile response whenever the stylus tip (5) passes through the in-presence boundary of the tablet. The “ in-presence boundary” is defined in Murphy as the distance of the stylus vertically above the tablet surface beyond which the position signals of the stylus are regarded as unreliable, because the tablet cannot accurately read those signals. Murphy specifically states that it is desirable to give the user an indication of whether the stylus is ‘in-presence’ (which is where the stylus is between ‘in-presence’ boundary and the tablet) or ‘out of presence’ (which is where the stylus is beyond the ‘in-presence’ boundary) and thus whether or not the workstation is tracking the stylus tip. Murphy describes applying a tactile response when the tip passes through the in-presence boundary towards the tablet as well as another tactile response when the tip passes through the in-presence boundary away the tablet. In particular, a sensor in the stylus determines the position of the stylus with respect to the in-presence boundary by communicating with the tablet. Once the sensor and tablet communicate that the table detects the stylus, the

stylus is considered passing through the in-presence boundary into the in-presence field or zone. In response, the actuator outputs a force to notify the user that the stylus is now in the 'in-presence' zone. Just the opposite, upon lifting the stylus out of presence zone with respect to the tablet, the sensor detects the stylus crossing the in-presence boundary and the actuator outputs a force to notify the user that the stylus is out of the range of the tablet.

In contrast, Murphy does not teach each and every limitation and element in the Claim 38. Claim 38 recites, among other things, a sensor configured to send at least one sensor signal to a host computer based on a coordinate position of the stylus **only when the stylus is moved against the surface**; and an actuator disposed within the stylus and configured to apply a haptic sensation in response to the at least one sensor signal indicating the stylus at a designated coordinate position **on the surface**. Murphy does not describe that the actuator outputs a force when the sensor signal indicates the stylus at a designated coordinate position on the surface; nor a sensor which outputs the sensor signal to the actuator only when the stylus is moved against the surface. As stated above, Murphy only outputs a tactile response when the stylus is sensed crossing an imaginary plane or boundary a certain distance above the surface to notify the user that the signals from the sensor are able to be read (or not read) by the tablet. However, Murphy does not teach that the actuator operates in conjunction with the sensor to provide haptic feedback while the sensor is sensed moving along the surface.

Claim 49 recites, among other things, a sensor configured to detect a coordinate position of the stylus against a surface and provide a coordinate position signal associated with the coordinate position of the stylus only while the stylus is moved along the surface; and an actuator coupled to the stylus and configured to vibrate in response to the sensor detecting the coordinate position of the stylus and the coordinate position signal indicating the stylus is

positioned at a designated location on the surface. As stated above, Murphy does not describe that the actuator vibrates in response to the sensor detecting the coordinate position of the stylus and the coordinate position signal indicating the stylus is positioned at a designated location **on the surface**. (emphasis added). Instead, Murphy only outputs a tactile response when the stylus is sensed crossing an imaginary plane a certain distance above the surface to notify the user that the signals from the sensor are able to be read (or not read) by the tablet. In addition, Murphy does not provide any teaching of a vibration, but only that a mass is moved up or down once when the stylus crosses the in-presence boundary. Applicant would like to note that Wikipedia is not a valid source for a dictionary definition considering that Wikipedia is an open source database in which it is possible for any user to enter inaccurate or incorrect information which is not credible. Notwithstanding, the Applicant kindly invites the Examiner to provide a dictionary definition of the term “vibrate” from a credible source.

Claim 55 recites, among other things, sending a coordinate position signal to a host computer only when the stylus is moved along the surface, the coordinate position signal associated with the sensed signal and indicating the coordinate position of the stylus along the surface; and applying a force from an actuator to the stylus in response to the coordinate position signal indicating the stylus being at a designated location on the surface. Instead, Murphy only outputs a tactile response when the stylus is sensed crossing an imaginary plane a distance above the surface to notify the user that the signals from the sensor are able to be read (or not read) by the tablet.

Therefore, Murphy does not expressly or inherently describe each and every element as set forth in Claims 38, 49 and 55, Murphy cannot be considered to anticipate Claims 38, 49 and 55, respectively. For at least these reasons, Claims 38 and 55 are allowable over Murphy.

Claims 39, 42, 43, 46, 47, 52, 54, 58 and 59 have also been rejected in light of Murphy. However, Claims 39, 42, 43, 46 and 47 are dependent on Independent Claim 38; Claims 52, and 54 are dependent on Independent Claim 49 and Claims 57 and 58 are dependent on Independent Claim 55. As stated above, Claims 38, 49 and 55 are allowable over Murphy. Accordingly, Claims 39, 42, 43, 46, 47, 52, 54, 58 and 59 are allowable for being dependent on allowable base claims.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 44, 45, 50, 51, 53 and 57 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Murphy in view of U.S. Re 34, 095 to Padula. This rejection is respectfully traversed. Regarding Claims 44 and 45, these claims are dependent on Claim 38; Claims 50, 51 and 53 are dependent on Claim 49; and Claims 57 is dependent on Claim 55. Claims 38, 49 and 55 are allowable over Murphy and Padula, individually or in combination for at least the reasons stated above. Accordingly, Claims 44, 45, 50, 51, 53 and 57 are allowable as being dependent on allowable base claims.

Claim 48 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Murphy in view of US Pat. No. 5,977,867 to Boulin. This rejection is respectfully traversed. Claim 48 is dependent on Claim 38, which is allowable for at least the reasons stated above. Accordingly, Claim 48 is allowable as being dependent on an allowable base claim.

Claim 40 and 41 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Murphy in view of US Pat. No. 5,917,472 to Taniishi. This rejection is respectfully traversed. Claims 40 and 41 are dependent on Claim 38, which is allowable for at least the reasons stated above. Accordingly, Claims 40 and 41 are allowable as being dependent on an allowable base claim.

Conclusion

It is believed that the present application is in condition for allowance and early favorable consideration of this reply is earnestly solicited. If, in the opinion of the Examiner, an interview would expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney at the number indicated below.

Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. Please charge any additional required fee or credit any overpayment not otherwise paid or credited to our deposit account No. 50-1698.

Respectfully submitted,

THELEN REID & PRIEST, LLP

Dated: 10/11/06



Suvashis Bhattacharya  
Reg. No. 46,554

Thelen Reid & Priest LLP  
P.O. Box 640640  
San Jose, CA 95164-0640  
Tel. (408) 292-5800  
Fax. (408) 287-8040